

celebrities who could afford that kind of recreational drug, and the general public, who, it could be safely said, knew very little of the drug. Its "mass impact" occurred in 1967, when, for a brief period, it was imported and used widely by the prevailing "counter-culture" as typified by "Haight-Ashbury" in those times. It was quickly made illegal.

Other points of note in your letter: to mention Aldous Huxley, out of all that could be mentioned, is the kind of coincidence that only occurs in the JFK case, because Huxley is one of two other famous individuals who died on November 22, 1963 [the other being the "Birdman of Alcatraz"]. With respect to magic mushroom, federal laws have been established to allow Native Americans, who have always used such hallucinogens in certain religious rites, to continue to do so. This led, in the 1960s, to the formation of a host of bogus cults all seeking the same rights as the Native Americans, and all were denied.

What Oswald knew of mind-altering, LSD-like drugs we can only conjecture. Clearly, the possibility is there, and certainly some of his actions from time to time, if performed today, would cause us to ask, "What's he been smoking?" Yet the definitive proof is lacking.

Many thanks for passing these thoughts to me and to our readers, and best wishes in your continuing research.

To the Editor:

In your latest issue (January, 1999) on page seven you mentioned an "internet post" discussing the passing of Jane Dishong who was a witness to the JFK assassination. I note you also said she is visible in the Z-film.

Can you send me the complete internet

report on Dishong and also can you pinpoint the precise location of her in the Z-film. I have in my files what may well be the most complete listing of witnesses and her name is not included. Also, are you aware of any Canton papers reporting her death? (I assume Canton is the city in Ohio.)

Any help you can provide me with on this, as I'm working in this area of the assassination, and her input can be important.

By the way, I note that on page 39 of your January issue you provided Greg Jaynes' input about the Fetzer and Lifton confrontation. Your article does mention the roles of Josiah Thompson and Art and Margaret Snyder, and, of course, in no way am I putting them down, but I was also part of that panel and I offered my proofs as to why Zapruder film alteration was untenable (in fact, ridiculous). My analysis was based on scientific and logical reasoning and added to the disproofs offered. I do feel very much responsible for having brought the subject of Z-film alteration to the "front burner" because it was my series of articles in the *Fourth Decade* that debunked their (the Fetzers, Twymans and Mantik's) arguments.

I note that as of this writing no-one has offered a disproof of what I presented at this panel hearing (which Jaynes attended) and I pointed this out to another panel hearing which the rival JFK conference held at another hotel.

Of course, "disproofs" can be offered on the Internet but since I don't own a computer or anything like an internet or a Website, I have seen no such disproof. Part of my evidence I cited at both conferences long before there was any question of Z-film alteration was evidence presented in earlier years and no one refuted that evidence either. Had these

supporters of Z-film alteration paid any real attention to what I reported and done their homework there would probably never be a "theory of Z-film alteration."

Best, Hal Verb

Dear Hal,

I will try to respond to all your concerns, and perhaps a chronological approach would be most helpful in that regard. First of all, I can offer nothing more about Jane Dishong, except to say that one atom of gray matter is nudging me to say that it might have been Canton, China where her passing was noted. I could be wrong on that one, and perhaps a subscriber will note your concern and contact you via your address in Gordon Winslow's directory, or through me, here at the journal.

Regarding the Z-film controversy: I was in the early stages of an illness last fall, and for that and other reasons, I did not get to Dallas as planned. I read Greg Jaynes' post, but it only referenced Drs. Fetzer and Thompson, with no mention, as I recall, of David Lifton. His focus was simply on those two individuals, who apparently had quite a shouting match. I contacted Dr. Thompson for his presentation, as he was declared "the winner" by seemingly everyone except Dr. Fetzer, and I offered the latter the opportunity to rebut Thompson's comments, which were printed in full in the April, 1999 issue of this journal. To date he has not done so. In Thompson's remarks, he made passing reference to the Snyders, but not to you, so that was as far as I could take the event, and not having been in Dallas, I was not aware of your presence on that panel. Certainly you know, and have long known, that I respect your work and expertise, or I

would never have asked you to write a blurb for the 1995 *JFK Assassination Quiz Book*. Beyond that, if you could boil your "Z-film non-alteration" evidence down to 3-6 pages, I would be happy to print it in an upcoming issue. Beyond that, I can do no more than thank you for your input, your 35 years of concern for JFK's assassination, and also remind you of the impossibility of proving a negative to a certainty. Be well, Hal.

Letter rephrased by editor:

Following the publication of the piece on the Sibert-O'Neill article (April, 1999), I received a lengthy letter from a former FBI S/A which contained a wealth of data. As the letter was printed on a letterhead, I contacted the former agent and asked if his data could be used in the journal, even if it meant withholding his name.

"No," he answered. "There's enough about me in there that the authorship could be traced."

"Could I say, for instance, 'An FBI agent, who once worked with agents Sibert and O'Neill told me that while one of them was reasonably articulate, the other would have had difficulty with a basic sentence?'"

"That's okay--and accurate," he said.

"So," I continued, "you would say that the problems of the Sibert-O'Neill report are ignorance, not intent?"

"Yes, absolutely."

"But the report is also very incomplete," I noted.

He agreed, suggesting the reporting agents went no further than their stated assignment--to take custody of the bullet(s) found.

I then asked about the Chapoton/Hosty article already prepared. he said the Bureau would not have had the resources to simply send off 100 agents,